

of nomenclature and result in the greatest confusion. Such an unnecessary change in the name of one of the widely known genera of animals would be beyond every reasonable regulation of nomenclature. In requesting the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to place the name *Panthera* Oken on the Official List of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology and asserting that there would be no need for this name, as he has done in his article 5, Hershkovitz himself calls for such confusion.

Dias de Avila-Pires (cited above) also disagrees with Morrison-Scott. But his real problem in doing so is not a nomenclatorial one but a problem of language. His statement: "To call a panther *Leo* is no more confusing than to call a lion, *Panthera*" seems to be a very unrealistic argument for rejecting a well established name in favour of another one which would be in no way better according to his own view.

In connection with this proposed preservation of *Panthera* Oken there is another problem. I have shown (Hemmer, l.c.) that the genus *Panthera* has to be subdivided into the two subgenera *Panthera* for lion, leopard and jaguar and *Tigris* for the tiger. The first mention of *Tigris* with generic meaning likewise dates from Oken, 1816, the second from Gray, 1862. As I have no firm intention of applying for a third name of Oken's to be validated, the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature may decide which of these two names should be valid.

In conclusion, I support and renew Morrison-Scott's application for conservation of "*Panthera* Oken, 1816" and request a decision on the author of the subgeneric name *Tigris*. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested to take the following action:

to use its plenary powers:

- (1) to validate the generic name *Panthera* Oken, 1816, as allowed by Opinion 417, and to designate *Felis pardus* L., 1758, as the type-species;
- (2) to decide on the subgeneric name *Tigris* between the authors Oken, 1816, and Gray, 1862.

REPLY TO MAYR'S COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED PRESERVATION OF *PAN* FROM OKEN, 1816. Z.N.(S.) 482

By Philip Hershkovitz (*Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

In his comment on preservation of *Pan* Oken, 1816, Professor Mayr (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 24 (2) : 66) declares, "to say as Hershkovitz does, that there is no need for stability for scientific names in this area because,"—then he goes on with a direct quotation from Hershkovitz (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 23 (2/3) : 68), italics mine—"few anthropologists, primatologists, zoologists, behaviorists, biomedical investigators and others using non-human primates in research . . . , are zoologists" is an argument the force of which I fail to understand."

In his statement, Mayr first attributes to me a conclusion of his own device and which is entirely alien to anything I said or implied. He then couples it with names of scientific professions I listed in a context diametrically opposed to his peculiar interpretation.

My original remarks, which Mayr obviously failed to understand, are clear and unequivocal exhortations to all who work with animals to seek stability of scientific names in harmony with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and Opinions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Pan, cited from "Oken, 1816" (*Lehrbuch Naturgeschichte* . . . , usually without definite page reference) is invalid because the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature rejected Oken's *Lehrbuch* for nomenclatorial purposes (Opinion 417, 1956). It has been shown that *Chimpansee* Voigt, 1831, is the oldest available name for the chimpanzee.

As explained in my comments, most users of *Pan* Oken, are not concerned or even aware of the status of the name. The vast majority tend to accept zoological names in good faith from secondary sources.

To my knowledge, no author of any taxonomic list or classification which includes *Pan*, and no proponent of the preservation of *Pan*, credit this generic name to a proper source or propose that it be preserved from a binomial author, and thus placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

Perhaps Mayr, Morrison-Scott, and others favouring preservation of *Pan* from Oken, 1816, are more concerned with the validation of Oken's *Lehrbuch* than with a valid name for the chimpanzee. Surely, most opposition to the use of *Pan* would dissolve were this name cited from its first correct usage for the chimpanzee, for example Palmer, 1904 (*Gen. Mamm.* : 508) and not from a zoologically dubious base and a nomenclatorially unacceptable work.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONCERNING THE GENERIC NAMES
MEGALICHTHYS AND *RHIZODUS* (PISCES). Z.N.(S.) 1690
(see volume 23, pages 117-120)

By E. I. White (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I agree entirely with Dr. Thomson's proposals, but the argument in favour of *Holoptychus nobilissimus* is incomplete as this species was originally described in 1835 as *Gyrolepis giganteus* L. Agassiz *Poiss. Foss.* 2 (1) : 175, pl. xix, fig. 13, and subsequently replaced in 1839 by *Holoptychus* (sic) *nobilissimus* L. Agassiz, in Murchison's *Silur. Syst.* : 600, pl. 11. bis., figs. 1, 2 (specific name *giganteus* withdrawn). The second action is illegal and must be properly put forward for the Commission to validate, particularly as the name *Holoptychius giganteus* was later used for another species (L. Agassiz, *Poiss. Foss.*, Vieux Grès Rouge, : 73, 140, pl. 24, figs. 3-10).

By Donald Baird (*Princeton University, New Jersey, U.S.A.*)

Let me voice strong support for K. S. Thomson's proposal to provide plenary sanction for the traditional application of the names *Megalichthys* and *Rhizodus* to the two most common crossopterygian fishes of the Carboniferous Period.

As Dr. Thomson justly points out, senseless confusion would result if the nearly universal usage of the past century were to be upset by nomenclatural pettifoggery.

His further proposal to validate current usage of the name *Holoptychius* is equally commendable. Confirmatory action by the Commission will be a boon to both specialist and non-specialist users of these generic names.